

1
2
3
4 JOHN B. FREITAS,
5 Plaintiff,
6 v.
7 NOEL WISE, et al.,
8 Defendants.
9

10 Case No. 21-cv-08176-JD
11

12
13 **ORDER**
14

15 Re: Dkt. Nos. 1, 3, 8, 9, 10
16

17 Pro se plaintiff John Freitas filed a complaint and an application for leave to proceed in
18 forma pauperis (IFP). Dkt. Nos. 1, 3. The IFP application is granted, and the complaint is
19 dismissed with leave to amend.

20 IFP requests are evaluated under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The first question is whether the
21 plaintiff's financial status excuses payment of the court's filing fees. The answer is yes. Freitas
22 states that he is unemployed, and pays monthly expenses of \$800 out of a monthly Social Security
23 benefit of \$1,000, which is his sole source of income. Dkt. No. 3. Freitas meets the financial
24 qualifications for IFP status.

25 The next question is whether the complaint is sufficient to stand, and the answer is no. The
26 Court may "at any time" dismiss an IFP complaint that fails to state a claim on which relief may
27 be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(3)(B). The standard is the same as under Federal Rule of Civil
Procedure 12(b)(6). *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012). As a pro se plaintiff,
Freitas "gets a liberal construction of his complaint and the benefit of any doubts, but he still must
satisfy the requirements of Rule 8 and state facts sufficient to allege a plausible claim." *Nordin v.*
Scott, No. 3:21-CV-04717-JD, 2021 WL 4710697, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2021).

1 The complaint does not satisfy these requirements. Freitas sued a California superior court
2 judge, Alameda County, and the State of California, for damages and injunctive relief under
3 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for alleged due process and equal protection claims, among others. Dkt. No. 1.
4 The claims appear to arise in connection with a residential foreclosure matter, but the oversize
5 complaint, which is more than 100 pages in length with attachments, is not entirely clear.

6 The state court judge is absolutely immune from suit for judicial actions undertaken in the
7 course of her official duties in connection with a case, unless the judge acted outside her judicial
8 capacity or in the complete absence of jurisdiction. *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11-12 (1991)
9 (*per curiam*); *Nordin*, 2021 WL 4710697, at *1 (citing *Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24, 28 (1980)).
10 This is true “however erroneous the act may have been,” “however injurious in its consequences it
11 may have proved to the plaintiff,” and irrespective of the judge’s motivation. *Cleavinger v.*
12 *Saxner*, 474 U.S. 193, 199-200 (1985) (internal quotations marks omitted). The Court emphasizes
13 that nothing in the record even remotely suggests that the state court judge acted in such a fashion.
14 The observation is intended purely to underscore the breadth of judicial immunity. In addition,
15 judges are specifically immune to damages claims, *see Wyatt v. Cole*, 504 U.S. 158, 164-65
16 (1992), and Section 1983 permits an injunction in extremely limited circumstances not present
17 here, *see Wolfe v. Strankman*, 392 F.3d 358, 366 (9th Cir. 2004). To the extent the complaint can
18 be apprehended, the state court judge here performed well within the scope of her judicial duties,
19 and so immunity applies.

20 For the State of California, “a State is not a ‘person’ within the meaning of § 1983.” *Will*
21 *v. Michigan Dep’t of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 65 (1989).

22 For Alameda County, the complaint does not allege facts plausibly demonstrating a pattern
23 or practice for Section 1983 purposes. *See Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658,
24 690-91 (1978); *Prebilich v. City of Cotati*, No. 3:21-CV-02380-JD, 2021 WL 5964597, at *1
25 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2021).

26 Consequently, the complaint is dismissed. Freitas may file an amended complaint by May
27 9, 2022, that is consistent with this order. No new parties may be added without the Court’s prior
28 consent. A failure to comply with these requirements will result in dismissal with prejudice under

1 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The request for judicial notice, Dkt. No. 2, is denied, and
2 the Court did not consider any of those materials. The motions for default judgment, Dkt. Nos. 8,
3 9, and 10, are terminated as moot. Freitas is advised that his motion filings did not conform to the
4 Civil Local Rules or the Court's standing orders. All non-conforming filings in the future will be
5 summarily terminated without further consideration, and Freitas may not be allowed to file revised
6 submissions.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: April 22, 2022

9
10
11 JAMES DONATO
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

